

MENTORING'S IMPACT ON SALESPERSON JOB SATISFACTION DIMENSIONS

NATHANIEL N. HARTMANN, *University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

BRIAN N. RUTHERFORD, *Kennesaw State University*

SCOTT B. FRIEND, *Miami University*

G. ALEXANDER HAMWI, *Missouri State University*

This study investigates the previously unexplored influence of mentoring and mentor source on salesperson multi-faceted job satisfaction. Sales research has yet to examine the influence of mentoring or mentor source on salesperson job satisfaction. Although research using non-sales samples demonstrates mentoring and mentor source affects mentee job satisfaction, such research examining multi-faceted job satisfaction does not exist. The lack of such research is meaningful because salesperson satisfaction with specific job facets uniquely influences outcomes and is uniquely influenced by antecedents. Findings of this study indicate salespeople with mentors report higher levels of satisfaction on six (i.e., supervisors, overall job, company policy and support, promotion and advancement, coworkers, customers) of the seven job satisfaction facets. Our findings further show salespeople with organizational mentors report higher levels of satisfaction on five of the seven facets than do salespeople with external mentors. Implications of these findings for sales managers and organizations are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Two areas of importance in sales force management are job satisfaction (e.g., Krush, Agnihotri, Trainor, & Krishnakumar, 2013; Pettijohn, Pettijohn, & Taylor, 2009; Schetzslle & Drollinger, 2014) and mentoring (e.g., Hartmann, Rutherford, Hamwi, & Friend, 2013; Hartmann, Rutherford, Feinberg, & Anderson, 2014; Locander, Weinberg, Mulki, & Locander, 2015). Within the stream of research focused on job satisfaction, some researchers investigate this increasingly important human resource variable as a multi-faceted construct (e.g., Friend, Johnson, Rutherford, & Hamwi, 2013; Rutherford, Boles, Hamwi, Madupalli, & Rutherford, 2009). This multi-faceted conceptualization of salesperson job satisfaction consists of seven facets, including a sales representative's satisfaction with supervisors, company policy and support, promotion and advancement, pay, coworkers, customers, and work (Churchill, Ford, & Walker 1974). Extant research demonstrates that salesperson satisfaction with specific job facets uniquely influences outcomes such as organizational commitment, turnover intention,

and organizational citizenship behavior (Hartmann et al., 2014; Rutherford et al., 2009; Ladik, Marshall, Lassk, & Moncrief, 2002). Given that satisfaction with specific job facets is also uniquely influenced by antecedents, and mentoring has been linked to global job satisfaction in the applied psychology literature (Allen, Eby, Poteet, Lentz, & Lima, 2004; Fagenson, 1989), a need exists to more clearly understand the influence of mentoring on each facet of salesperson job satisfaction. Elucidating this influence would allow researchers and managers to develop more informed conclusions regarding the downstream impact on salesperson outcomes.

Prior sales research has yet to link mentoring or mentor source (i.e., organizational mentor, external mentor) to job satisfaction. However, sales research has shown mentoring and mentor source to influence a number of outcomes associated with satisfaction. These outcomes include increased mentee job performance (Brashear, Bellenger, Boles, & Barksdale, 2006), organizational commitment (Hartmann et al., 2013), and occupational commitment (Hartmann et al., 2013), as well as decreased mentee turnover intentions (Brashear et al., 2006). Nevertheless, research regarding the influence of mentoring and mentor source on multi-faceted job satisfaction remains

unexplored. This is an important shortcoming given that the goals of mentorship programs within sales organizations often include the performance development, satisfaction, and retention of their sales force.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between mentoring and multi-faceted job satisfaction in salespeople (i.e., whether mentoring has a significant relationship with multiple facets of job satisfaction) and any difference in levels of multi-faceted job satisfaction of mentees attributable to their mentor source (i.e., whether the source of mentoring matters). By expanding our understanding of mentoring in relation to multi-faceted job satisfaction, firms are provided with key pieces of information regarding the extent to which mentors increase salesperson satisfaction with specific facets of the job. This is important to managers because employee satisfaction is positively associated with organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, business-unit outcomes such as profit and productivity, and diminished turnover intention (Harter, Schmidt, & Hayes, 2002).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Unique Nature of the Sales Role

Salespersons serve in a boundary-spanning role seeking to create value by fulfilling the sometimes conflicting objectives and interests of their own organization as well as those of their buyers through the development and maintenance of long-term relationships with customers (Hartmann and Rutherford, 2015; Krush et al., 2013). As others have highlighted, this boundary spanning role is characterized by high levels of autonomy, ambiguity, interaction, and discretionary influence (Avlonitis & Panagopoulos, 2006; Zolkiewski, 2011). This role is also in a state of substantial change. Modern salespeople are faced with an array of new demands stemming from increasing marketplace complexity and customer demands. Indeed, modern salespeople develop and manage customer relationships in a marketplace characterized by ever-changing buyer demands, an increasing number of products and services (Jones, Brown, Zoltners, & Weitz, 2005), and an increasing emphasis on

customized solutions (Blocker, Cannon, Panagopoulos, & Sager, 2012). To meet these demands, salespeople are regularly asked to traverse organizational resources (Bradford et al., 2010) and leverage advice from organizational figures to increase their performance (Boyer, Artis, Solomon, & Fleming, 2012; Ingram, LaForge, Locander, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2005). Mentoring relationships may aid salespeople in meeting such job demands, while also offering psychosocial support.

Mentoring

Mentoring relationships are relationships involving consistent interaction between a more skilled or experienced person (i.e., the mentor) and a lesser skilled or experienced person (i.e., the mentee) with the goal of advancing the mentee's competencies and career (Haggard, Dougherty, Turban, & Wilbanks, 2011). Mentors aid the advancement of mentee competencies and careers. As such, mentoring is associated with a number of beneficial attitudinal and behavioral outcomes for salesperson mentees. For example, mentoring has been linked to increases in salesperson mentee job performance (Brashear et al., 2006), organizational commitment (Hartmann et al., 2013), occupational commitment (Hartmann et al., 2013), and diminished turnover intention (i.e., Brashear et al., 2006). Moreover, mentoring is negatively associated with salesperson lone wolf tendencies (Locander et al., 2015), a psychological state characterized by negative attitudes regarding working with others (Dixon, Gassenheimer, & Barr, 2003). Benefits of mentoring for the mentor can include greater rejuvenation, job performance, satisfaction with the job, satisfaction with coworkers, satisfaction with the company, and satisfaction with job opportunities (Pullins & Fine, 2002).

The literature provides evidence that examining boundary conditions yields an increased understanding of the impact of mentoring on mentees (Chao, Walz, & Gardner, 1992; Haggard et al., 2011; Ragins, Cotton, & Miller, 2000). One such boundary condition is the source of the mentor (i.e., whether they are organizational mentors and external mentors.) Each source of mentors offers relative

advantages with regard to supporting mentees. Organizational mentors are employed by the same organization as mentees and are conceptualized to provide greater organizational resources, accessibility, protection, sponsorship, and challenging assignments than external mentors (Ragins, 1997). External mentors are not employed by the same organization as mentees. External mentors are conceptualized to offer greater inter-organizational resources and career mobility than organizational mentors (Ragins, 1997). Furthermore, as external mentors are removed from the organization and intra-organizational politics (Ragins, 1997), external mentors are able to provide support with greater degrees of concern for the salesperson and less concern for the welfare of the organization. The respective differences between organizational and external mentors with regard to supporting mentees suggests that organizational and external mentors may uniquely influence salesperson mentee job satisfaction facets.

Multi-Faceted Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is a “pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one’s job values” (Locke, 1969, p. 316). Sales researchers (e.g., Johnston, Varadarajan, Futrell, & Sager, 1987; Russ & McNeilly, 1995; Rutherford et al., 2009) recognize that job satisfaction is a complex emotional reaction to “all characteristics of the job itself and the work environment” (Churchill et al., 1974, p. 255) and often assess job satisfaction using multi-faceted measures. A review of the work on job satisfaction shows that each of the facets can be categorized into one of three forms of satisfaction – instrumental satisfaction, social satisfaction, and egocentric satisfaction (Nerkar, McGrath & MacMillan; Friend et al. 2013). These three forms of satisfaction differ in their explanation of what aspects of the sales role ultimately determine job satisfaction levels, and thus may also vary in terms of explaining what variables predict instrumental, social, and egocentric satisfaction.

First, instrumental satisfaction represents the salesperson’s satisfaction with behaviors associated with performance and task accomplishments (i.e., satisfaction with overall

job). Second, social satisfaction denotes the salesperson’s satisfaction with work relationships and social interactions (i.e., satisfaction with supervisors, satisfaction with coworkers, satisfaction with customers). Third, egocentric satisfaction reflects the salesperson’s satisfaction with benefits received (i.e., satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with promotion and advancement). Finally, “satisfaction with policy does not appear to conceptually fit within the instrumental, social, or egocentric satisfaction dimensions; however it does play an assumed role in providing the managerial oversight and support necessary for individuals to appropriately set expectations” (Friend et al. 2013; p.421).

Beyond the conceptual aspects, a review of the empirical elements of the job satisfaction literature shows that sales researchers assessing multi-faceted satisfaction commonly use one of the following three measures: the Job Description Index (JDI) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) (Hackman & Oldham, 1975), or the INDSALES scale (Churchill et al., 1974). The JDI and JDS assess satisfaction with specific facets of the work environment; however, these scales do not assess satisfaction with specific facets unique to salespeople. The INDSALES scale is an extension of the JDI and JDS and seeks to capture affective evaluations of the work environment specific to salespeople (Churchill et al., 1974). The INDSALES scale assesses satisfaction with supervisors, overall job, company policy and support, promotion and advancement, pay, coworkers, and customers. Research using the INDSALES scale generally demonstrates that salespeople experience varying degrees of satisfaction with each of these seven facets of the work environment (e.g., Boles, Madupalli, Rutherford, & Wood, 2007; Ladik et al., 2002; Parasuraman & Futrell, 1983; Rutherford et al., 2009).

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Research outside of the sales context provides a large degree of support for the notion that mentoring is positively associated with job satisfaction (Allen et al., 2004; Fagenson, 1989). For example, Allen et al. (2004), in a meta-analytical examination consisting of a

sample of 10 correlations and 3,029 observations, found that mentees report higher levels of job satisfaction than do non-mentees. While extant research does not examine differences between mentees and non-mentees pertaining to multi-faceted job satisfaction, support does exist in piecemeal fashion for each categorization of the satisfaction facets. First, research shows that mentees exhibit higher performance than non-mentees (Brashear et al., 2006; Eby, Allen, Evans, Ng, & DuBois, 2008). As a result, salesperson with mentors may experience higher degrees of instrumental satisfaction. Second, a meta-analytic review of the mentoring literature provides evidence that mentees receive benefits with respect to their interpersonal relationships with others (Eby et al. 2008). As a result, salespersons with mentors may experience higher degrees of social satisfaction. Third, mentees experience greater success within their company (Allen et al., 2004; Fagenson, 1989), recognition (Fagenson, 1989), career mobility (Fagenson, 1989), and compensation (Allen et al., 2004), than do non-mentees. Thus, salespersons with mentors may experience higher degrees of egocentric satisfaction. Moreover, the benefits mentees receive with regards to their interpersonal relationships with others, success within their company, and compensation may lead salespersons with mentors to experience higher satisfaction with company policy and support. In summary, it reasons that salesperson mentees experience higher levels of satisfaction with each facet of the work environment than do non-mentees. Therefore, we hypothesize salespersons with mentors will experience higher satisfaction across all facets.

H₁: Salespersons with mentors will exhibit higher levels of satisfaction with: a) supervisors, b) overall job, c) company policy and support, d) promotion and advancement, e) pay, f) coworkers, and g) customers than salespersons without mentors.

Extant research neglects to examine the relationship between mentor source and mentee multi-faceted job satisfaction. However, there are reasons to suggest that the influence of organizational and external mentors is not equivalent. Relative to external mentors, organizational mentors are better able to draw from their social capital, personal experiences,

and observations within the organization to offer mentee's instrumental, social, and egocentric benefits that improve the intricacies of the mentee's organization and work environment. For example, similar to coaching (Boyer et al., 2012; Onyemah, 2009), an organizational mentor can help a mentee better understand how he or she is performing and use specific situations as teaching opportunities. Moreover, given their closer proximity, organizational mentors are able to provide mentees with greater opportunities to observe and model mentor job attitudes and behaviors. Such modeling may result in greater instrumental satisfaction due to enhanced skill development and role understanding (Lankau & Scandura, 2002). Organizational mentors also offer greater opportunities for improving the working relationships within their organization that are critical to their role (i.e., social satisfaction), as well as hold positions within the organization that carry more influence over the mentee's promotion and advancement considerations (i.e., egocentric satisfaction). On the other hand, external mentors can offer greater opportunities to improve salesperson satisfaction with considerations external to their organization (Ragins, 1997). However, these inter-organizational advantages may be negligible to salespersons given that their close working relationships with customers and prospects often provide access to similar resources and avenues for career mobility.

H₂: Salespersons with organizational mentors exhibit higher levels of satisfaction with: a) supervisors, b) job, c) company policy and support, d) promotion and advancement, e) pay, f) coworkers, and g) customers than salespersons with external mentors.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

Data for this study were collected using an online panel which rewards respondents with incentive points redeemable for merchandise. Online panels are a commonly accepted data collection standard in sales research, especially when a set of individuals with a specific skill set (i.e., salespeople) are the desired sample (Johnson, 2016). An upper limit of 1,050

respondents was set due to financial constraints. The questionnaire was made accessible online to panel participants previously self-identifying as working within sales. A total of 2,443 potential respondents entered the questionnaire site. Filters were set to ensure that each participant was currently working in a sales position. Respondents that did not answer the question or answered "no" to the sales position filter were removed. This resulted in 1,112 screen outs. Once the data collection reached the limit of 1,050 completed surveys, partially completed surveys (n = 281) were no longer accessible to respondents.

In limiting the analysis to persons serving solely in a selling role, respondents self-reporting as being an owner or senior manager were removed from the analysis (n = 31). Additionally, on the basis that respondents need experience with both their organization and sales to form perceptions of the work environment and develop a mentoring relationship, respondents with less than one year of organizational or sales experience were removed (n=35). Listwise deletion was utilized resulting in a sample size of 647 respondents,

an effective usable response rate of 26.48%. Of the respondents, 117 (18.08%) report having a mentor; of these, 68 respondents had an organizational mentor and 49 respondents had an external mentor. Table 1 provides demographic characteristics for respondents.

Retail and industrial salespeople comprised 69.55% and 30.45% of the respondents, respectively. This is consistent with the U.S. population of people working in retail versus industrial positions (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). The retail and industrial salespeople worked within a diverse range of sectors and industries. The most heavily represented retail sectors included building material, garden equipment and supplies dealers (13.8%), clothing and clothing accessories stores (12.35%), food and beverage stores (11.38%), real estate and licensing (11.14%), health and personal care stores (9.2%), and finance and insurance (8.95%). The most heavily represented industrial sectors included manufacturing (30.61%), wholesale trade (16.84%), professional scientific and technical services (10.71%), and industrial finance and insurance (9.69%).

TABLE 1:
Sample Characteristics

Descriptive	Non-mentee	Mentee	Organizational Mentor	External Mentor
N	530	117	68	49
Age	47.82	48.42	47.46	49.76
Gender (Female %)	55.3%	56.4%	63.2%	46.9%
Marital Status				
Single	22.5%	22.4%	19.1%	27.1%
Married	60.0%	53.4%	55.9%	50.0%
Divorced	11.6%	14.7%	14.7%	14.6%
Other	5.9%	9.5%	10.3%	8.3%
Education				
No College	17.5%	15.4%	22.1%	6.1%
Some College	32.5%	33.3%	29.4%	38.8%
College (undergraduate degree)	32.6%	29.1%	32.3%	24.5%
College (advanced degree)	17.4%	22.2%	16.2%	30.6%
Sales Experience (years)	10.05	8.33	7.78	9.10
Organizational Tenure (years)	9.43	7.62	7.31	8.05

Measures

Job satisfaction was assessed using the reduced 28-item INDSALES scale (Churchill et al., 1974; Comer, Machleit, & Lagace, 1989). Each job satisfaction facet was assessed using 4 items which asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). To assess mentoring, respondents were first asked to indicate whether they currently had a mentor by responding yes or no. Second, respondents who had a mentor were then asked to identify whether the mentor was currently within their organization or external to the organization.

Analytical Approach

Using the mentoring (Ensher, Thomas, & Murphy, 2001; Kram, 1985; Ragins et al., 2000; Lankau & Scandura, 2002) and sales (Brashear et al., 2006; Hartmann et al., 2013; Fine & Pullins, 1998) literature as a reference, a number of plausible covariates were examined. This analysis suggested including mentee gender, age, organizational tenure, and education as covariates. Next, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to assess the ability of the measurement model to fit the data. Following Hu and Bentler's (1999) recommendations, values close to .95 for overall fit indices (e.g., CFI, TLI and IFI), .06 for RMSEA, and .08 for SRMR were used as indicators of good fit. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used to test the hypothesized relationships.

RESULTS

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Results of the initial CFA, performed on the full sample ($n = 647$), indicate the measurement model produced marginal fit ($\chi^2 = 1246.06$; $df = 329$; $CFI = .94$; $TLI = .93$; $IFI = .94$; $RMSEA = .066$; $SRMR = .07$). The modification indices indicated that one item each of the three satisfaction facets (i.e., promotion and advancement, coworker and customer satisfaction) and two items from the satisfaction with pay facet were problematic. Examination of the problematic items indicated that four of the five items removed were reverse coded

items. One or more of these reverse coded items has been reported to be problematic by other sales research investigating multi-faceted job satisfaction (Hartmann et al., 2014; Katsikea, Theodosiou, Perdakis, & Kehagias, 2011; Rutherford et al., 2009). Reverse coded items can contribute to unexpected factor structures partially due to respondent misunderstandings (Swain, Weathers, & Niedrich, 2008). Results of the revised model, displayed in Table 2, indicate good fit ($\chi^2 = 448.18$; $df = 209$; $CFI = .98$; $TLI = .98$; $IFI = .98$; $RMSEA = .042$; $SRMR = .03$).

Convergent and discriminant validity of the measures were examined. All standardized factor loadings were significant ($p < .001$) and met or exceeded the .70 threshold, providing evidence of convergent validity (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Average variance extracted (AVE) estimates, composite reliabilities, and Cronbach alpha reliabilities for satisfaction with supervisors (78%, .94, .94), overall job (82%, .95, .95), company policy and support (79%, .94, .94), promotion and advancement (55%, .79, .78), pay (61%, .76, .76), coworkers (76%, .90, .89), and customers (72%, .88, .89) were generally strong, providing further support for convergent validity (Hair et al., 2010). All AVE estimates exceeded the corresponding squared interconstruct correlation estimates (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) providing support for the discriminant validity of the measures.

The revised measurement model was also examined in relation to the mentors only ($n = 117$). The results produced acceptable fit ($\chi^2 = 328.15$; $df = 209$; $CFI = .95$; $TLI = .94$; $IFI = .95$; $RMSEA = .07$; $SRMR = .05$). Moreover, assessments using the aforementioned approaches provide evidence of discriminant and convergent validity.

ANCOVA Results

H_1 posited that salespersons with mentors would report higher levels of satisfaction with each facet of the work environment than salespersons without mentors. Results for H_1 , along with adjusted and unadjusted means, for both salesperson mentees and non-mentees are displayed in Table 3. For six of the satisfaction facets, the means were significantly higher for

TABLE 2:
Standardized Factor Loadings and Satisfaction Facet Correlations

	Standardized factor loadings						
<i>Supervisors</i>							
My supervisor really tries to get our ideas about things.	.86						
My supervisor has always been fair in dealings with me.	.88						
My supervisor gives us credit and praise for work well done.	.89						
My supervisor lives up to his/her promises.	.90						
<i>Overall Job</i>							
My work gives a sense of accomplishment.	.85						
My job is exciting.	.92						
My work is satisfying.	.96						
I'm really doing something worthwhile in my job.	.89						
<i>Company Policy and Support</i>							
Management is progressive.	.89						
Top management really knows its job.	.89						
This organization operates efficiently and smoothly.	.89						
People in this organization receive good support from the home office.	.87						
<i>Promotion and Advancement</i>							
My opportunities for advancement are limited. (Reverse scaled)	.72						
There are plenty of good jobs here for those who want to get ahead.	.70						
I have a good chance for promotion.	.81						
<i>Pay</i>							
I'm paid fairly compared with other employees in this organization.	.79						
My income is adequate for normal expenses.	.77						
<i>Coworkers</i>							
My fellow workers are pleasant.	.90						
The people I work with are very friendly.	.94						
The people I work with help each other out when someone falls behind or gets in a tight spot.	.76						
<i>Customers</i>							
My customers are trustworthy.	.82						
My customers are loyal.	.80						
My customers are understanding.	.92						
Satisfaction Facet Correlations							
Supervisors	--						
Overall Job	.60**	--					
Company Policy and Support	.68**	.63**	--				
Promotion and Advancement	.47**	.47**	.51**	--			
Pay	.44**	.45**	.43**	.43**	--		
Coworkers	.61**	.46**	.50**	.32**	.35**	--	
Customers	.24**	.37**	.23**	.18**	.15**	.28**	--

mentees than non-mentees. However, mentees did not report significantly higher levels of satisfaction with pay than did non-mentees ($F = 2.66$; $p = .10$).

Although mentees report higher levels of satisfaction with promotion and advancement than non-mentees, Levene's test of equality of error variance ($F = 10.14$; $p < .01$) was significant, indicating that the homogeneity of variance assumption across groups was violated. Although numerous statisticians show that the F statistic is robust to homogeneity of variance assumption violations (e.g., Stevens, 2009; Myers, Well, & Lorch, 2013), significant alpha levels should be set more stringently when this assumption is violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Hence, the influence of mentoring on satisfaction with promotion and advancement was evaluated using an alpha level of .01. Results indicated a significant difference between mentees and non-mentees with respect to satisfaction with promotion and advancement ($F = 20.44$; $p < .001$). To confirm the robustness of this finding, H_{1d} was also evaluated using the log transformation of satisfaction with promotion and advancement. After transforming satisfaction with promotion and advancement, Levene's statistic was no longer significant ($F = .59$; $p = .44$) although

mentoring was ($F = 12.02$; $p < .001$). Hence, H_1 (a, b, c, d, f, g) was supported.

Within the examination of H_1 (a, b, c, e, f, g), the covariate age was significantly associated to satisfaction with supervisors ($F = 10.72$; $p < .001$), overall job ($F = 19.44$; $p < .001$), company policy and support ($F = 5.64$; $p < .05$), pay ($F = 5.10$; $p < .05$), coworkers ($F = 4.95$; $p < .05$), and customers ($F = 13.15$; $p < .001$). In H_{1d} , gender was significantly associated with satisfaction with promotion and advancement before ($F = 5.74$; $p < .05$) and after the transformation ($F = .86$; $p < .01$). Organizational tenure ($F = 8.50$; $p < .01$) and education ($F = 8.94$; $p < .01$) were significantly associated with satisfaction with pay (H_{1e}).

H_2 posited that salespersons with organizational mentors would report higher levels of each facet of job satisfaction than salespersons with external mentors. As Table 4 displays, salespersons with organizational mentors reported higher levels of satisfaction with a number of facets compared to salespersons with external mentors. Salespersons with organizational mentors reported significantly higher mean levels of satisfaction with supervisors (H_{2a}), overall job (H_{2b}), company policy and support (H_{2c}), pay (H_{2e}), and

TABLE 3:
Summary of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis	Dependent Variable	Mentor / No Mentor	Adjusted Mean	Unadjusted Mean	SD	F	p	Conclusion
H_{1a}	Supervisors	Mentor	5.41	5.42	1.46	10.24	<.001	Supported
		No Mentor	4.91	4.91	1.54			
H_{1b}	Overall Job	Mentor	5.59	5.59	1.55	20.36	<.001	Supported
		No Mentor	4.92	4.92	1.46			
H_{1c}	Company Policy and Support	Mentor	5.10	5.09	1.56	15.54	<.001	Supported
		No Mentor	4.46	4.46	1.60			
H_{1d}	Promotion and Advancement	Mentor	4.36	4.37	1.85	20.44	<.001	Supported
		No Mentor	3.61	3.61	1.57			
H_{1e}	Pay	Mentor	4.62	4.59	1.62	2.66	.10	Not Supported
		No Mentor	4.36	4.37	1.52			
H_{1f}	Coworkers	Mentor	5.61	5.62	1.21	4.27	<.05	Supported
		No Mentor	5.35	5.35	1.21			
H_{1g}	Customers	Mentor	5.82	5.83	.97	10.28	<.001	Supported
		No Mentor	4.93	5.49	.99			

coworkers (H_{2f}) than did salespersons with external mentors.

H_2 (b, c, g), which examined the impact of organizational mentors relative to external mentors on satisfaction with overall job, company policy and support, and customers, failed Levene's test of equality of error variance ($F = 8.22$; $p < .01$; $F = 5.94$; $p < .05$; $F = 4.59$; $p < .05$). In each case, the probability plot and histogram indicated a pronounced negative skew to the data. Hence, H_2 (b, c, g) was evaluated using an alpha level .01. Results indicated a significant difference between salespersons with organizational mentors and salespersons with external mentors with respect to satisfaction with overall job (H_{2b} ; $F = 12.40$; $p < .001$) and company policy and support (H_{2c} ; $F = 9.81$; $p < .01$), but not customers (H_{2g} ; $F = .06$; $p = .81$). The robustness of the effect of organizational mentors, relative to external mentors, on satisfaction with overall job, company policy and support, and customers was examined after a reflect and inverse transformation of these satisfaction facets. For satisfaction with overall job, Levene's statistic was no longer significant ($F = 1.85$; $p = .17$), although mentoring was significant (H_{2b} ; $F = 4.26$; $p < .05$). For satisfaction with company policy and support, Levene's statistic was no longer significant ($F = .26$; $p = .61$), although

mentoring was marginally significant (H_{2c} ; $F = 3.58$; $p = .06$). For satisfaction with customers, neither Levene's statistic ($F = 3.37$; $p = .07$) nor mentoring (H_{2g} ; $F = .39$; $p = .53$) were significant. Hence, with the exception of satisfaction with promotion and advancement (H_{2d}) and customers (H_{2g}), the hypothesis that salespersons with organizational mentors report higher levels of satisfaction with each facet of their work compared to salespersons with external mentors received support.

Several covariates were significantly associated with one or more satisfaction facets. Age was associated with satisfaction with overall job before ($F = 5.27$; $p < .05$) and after the transformation ($F = 7.28$; $p < .01$). Both gender ($F = 5.99$; $p < .05$) and organizational tenure ($F = 4.35$; $p < .05$) were associated with satisfaction with promotion and advancement.

DISCUSSION

Results of the present study raise several discussion points. Extant literature, outside of the sales context, provides strong support for the notion that mentees experience higher levels of global job satisfaction than do non-mentees (Allen et al., 2004; Fagenson, 1989). However, such research fails to examine the impact of mentoring on multi-faceted job satisfaction.

TABLE 4
Summary of Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis	Dependent Variable	Mentor / No Mentor	Adjusted Mean	Unadjusted Mean	SD	F	p	Conclusion
H_{2a}	Supervisors	Organizational	5.78	5.74	1.29	9.74	<.01	Supported
		External	4.93	4.98	1.59			
H_{2b}	Overall Job	Organizational	6.00	5.94	1.20	12.40	<.001	Supported
		External	5.02	5.10	1.83			
H_{2c}	Company Policy and Support	Organizational	5.47	5.43	1.25	9.81	<.01	Supported
		External	4.56	4.61	1.82			
H_{2d}	Promotion and Advancement	Organizational	4.57	4.54	1.81	2.05	.16	Not Supported
		External	4.09	4.12	1.89			
H_{2e}	Pay	Organizational	4.89	4.94	1.33	7.51	<.01	Supported
		External	4.18	4.11	1.54			
H_{2f}	Coworkers	Organizational	5.81	5.79	1.10	4.11	<.05	Supported
		External	5.35	5.36	1.32			
H_{2g}	Customers	Organizational	5.85	5.86	.86	.06	.81	Not Supported
		External	5.80	5.78	1.11			

This study extends this literature and examines mentoring in the sales context. The results indicate salesperson mentees report higher levels of job satisfaction with six facets of their work environment (supervisors, overall job, company policy and support, promotion and advancement, pay, coworkers, customers) than do non-mentees. However, salesperson mentees did not report higher levels of satisfaction with pay than non-mentees.

The existing literature base also generally fails to examine the relationship between the source of the mentor and mentee multi-faceted job satisfaction. This study asserts that organizational mentors have a greater impact on mentee multi-faceted job satisfaction than do external mentors. This greater impact is because organizational mentors are better able to draw from their social capital, personal experiences, and observations within the organization to offer mentee's support that accounts for the intricacies of the mentee's specific role. The results of this study generally support this assertion. Mentees with organizational mentors report higher levels of satisfaction with supervisors, overall job, company policy and support, pay, and coworkers than do mentees with external mentors.

Discussion of the Covariates

Scatterplots, or one-way ANOVA tests, were used to yield additional insight into the effects of mentee age, gender, organizational tenure, and education on the satisfaction facets. Within H_1 , age was significantly associated with satisfaction with supervisors, overall job, company policy and support, pay, coworkers, and customers. Within H_2 , age was significantly associated with satisfaction with the overall job. The scatterplots suggest that satisfaction with supervisors, overall job, company policy and support, pay, coworkers, and customer's increase with age. Gender was significantly associated with satisfaction with promotion and advancement in H_1 and H_2 . Males reported higher levels of satisfaction with promotion and advancement than females in both the mentor/no-mentor condition (\bar{x} (male) = 3.94; \bar{x} (female) = 3.59; $F = 6.97$; $p < .01$) and organizational/external mentor condition (\bar{x} (male) = 4.78; \bar{x} (female) = 4.05; $F = 4.75$; $p < .05$).

Given that females comprised approximately 55% of the sample and accounted for approximately 56% of mentees, the lack of equivalent satisfaction with promotion and advancement levels across gender provides further anecdotal support for the continued prevalence of "glass ceilings" for females in organizations. Organizational tenure was significantly associated with satisfaction with pay in H_1 and satisfaction with promotion and advancement in H_2 . Within the mentor/no mentor examination, satisfaction with pay increased as organizational tenure increased. Interestingly, within the organizational/external mentor condition, satisfaction with promotion and advancement decreased as organizational tenure increased. Within H_1 , education was significantly associated with satisfaction with pay. In general, individuals with greater education reported greater satisfaction with pay.

Post Hoc Examination of Mentoring

While the results indicate that mentoring is positively associated with mentee satisfaction on six job facets, caution needs to be taken when assuming that all forms of mentoring impact yield similar effects. Results indicate that salesperson mentees with organizational mentors report higher levels of satisfaction across five facets of the work environment (supervision, overall job, company policy and support, pay, coworkers) than do mentees with mentor's external to the organization. The adjusted and unadjusted means displayed in both Table 3 and Table 4 raise questions as to whether or not mentees with external mentors report higher levels of satisfaction with specific facets of the work environment than do non-mentees. To clarify whether differences existed between those with external mentors and those without mentors, a post hoc examination using the ANCOVA procedure was conducted. The results indicated that salespersons with external mentors did not significantly differ from salespersons without mentors on their satisfaction with supervisors ($F = .04$; $p = .85$), overall job ($F = .41$; $p = .52$), company policy and support ($F = .43$; $p = .51$), pay ($F = 1.10$; $p = .30$), or coworkers ($F = .01$; $p = .98$). However, salespersons with external mentors reported marginally higher levels of satisfaction with customers ($F = 3.19$; $p = .08$) than did salespersons without mentors. Moreover,

salespersons with external mentors reported higher levels of satisfaction with promotion and advancement ($F = 3.86$; $p < .05$) than did salespersons without mentors. The results of this post hoc examination further support the beneficial role of organizational mentors in increasing salesperson mentee satisfaction, which holds implications for organizations who aim to retain high performers.

Managerial Implications

Sales practitioners, especially those at the managerial level, find it important to positively influence organizational outcomes such as performance and organizational commitment, and reduce the negative impacts of outcomes such as burnout and turnover intentions. One way in which managers can influence these outcomes is through the multiple facets of job satisfaction. Thus, it is important for managers to understand how organizational antecedents directly affect the facets of job satisfaction, and, by extension, indirectly influence organizational outcomes.

One way in which the facets of job satisfaction can be directly influenced is through mentoring. First, if managers want to increase the instrumental satisfaction of a particular employee of the sales force in general, results of our study show that providing an organizational mentor or establishing a mentoring program for the sales force may be a beneficial approach. An organizational mentor may help guide the salesperson to a better understanding of what the tasks and duties of their positions are, what management expects as far as productivity and performance, and how to deal with two different sources of authority with different demands. If the aim is to increase social satisfaction, an organizational mentor could help guide a mentee salesperson on the best methods for achieving success when communicating with managers, fellow co-workers or customers. The mentor's previous experience with what communication methods and/or styles have been successful and with the temperament of the mentee's managers, co-workers and/or customers could be very useful. Finally, if egocentric satisfaction needs to be improved, an organizational mentor could lean on their previous knowledge and experience within the firm to help employees achieve

desired increases in monetary compensation and promotion. An experienced mentor may better understand what performance outcomes management holds most important, and help guide their mentee towards improvements in these areas.

Given that Generation Y wants mentoring (Reisenwitz and Iyer, 2009), the importance of organizational mentors is likely to increase in the future. Several avenues are available to managers seeking to increase the prevalence of organizational mentoring relationships. An important factor to consider is organizational culture. Organizational beliefs, assumptions and values that promote the development of mentoring relationships are more likely to lead to successful mentoring relationships (Hatch, 1993; Schein, 1985). Organizational beliefs and assumptions play major roles in shaping organizational principles, philosophies, goals, and standards which shape employee behaviors such as mentoring. Organizational beliefs and assumptions which encourage teamwork, empowerment, goodwill, and coaching may be more likely to lead to the development of organizational mentoring relationships.

Organizations should also evaluate the extent to which the organization formally and informally supports and incentivizes its employees to act as mentors and mentees. One plausible means of providing such support is to offer mentors and mentees opportunities to interact with one another. Organizational networking events, training gatherings, and cross-functional teams each present opportunities for potential mentors and mentees to connect and interact. Such opportunities also seemingly diminish expected and realized search costs in finding a mentor/mentee which may be particularly important for salespeople, as salespeople often operate in silos with less contact with coworkers than their counterparts.

Organizations can formally support mentoring relationships by incorporating mentoring responsibilities into senior employees' development plans and performance metrics. While it might seem that requiring senior employees to mentor may negatively impact their ability to meet other job demands, this may not necessarily be the case. After all, salesperson mentors receive rejuvenation, job

satisfaction, and performance benefits from mentoring (Pullins & Fine, 2002). Such benefits may offset the time, energy, and other costs of serving as a mentor.

Interestingly, results of the post-hoc analysis indicate that salespeople with external mentors only differ from salespeople without mentors on the satisfaction with promotion and advancement facet at $p < .05$. Thus, the results suggest that external mentors do not play a large role in shaping salesperson job attitudes, or at least multi-faceted job satisfaction. Hence, when the objective is to increase job satisfaction, the findings of this research suggest that organizations should encourage their salespeople to develop organizational, rather than external, mentoring relationships.

Limitations

This study possesses several limitations. First, not uncommon to the mentoring literature (e.g., Haggard et al., 2011), the present study did not provide a definition of mentoring to respondents. While this approach increases the possibility of respondent confusion, this approach was employed in an attempt to control for respondent variation in conceptualizing mentoring. A review of the mentoring literature reports extreme variation in the breadth and specificity of mentoring definitions, leading Haggard et al. (2011, p.286) to question whether researchers who do provide a definition of mentoring are substituting the "variability of respondent perceptions with the variability of researcher perceptions." Also, the roles and types of support provided by mentors may vary substantially across contexts and types of mentoring relationships (Haggard et al., 2011). Given the interest in the influence of mentoring, in general, on satisfaction with each facet of the sales job, a definition of mentoring was therefore not imposed on respondents. Not including a definition of mentoring, however, may have increased the amount of variability in the data, thereby making it more difficult to detect statistical differences between groups, and contributed to the low percentage (18.08%) of salespeople identifying as having a mentor. Future research examining mentoring within the sales context should seek to re-examine the results of this study using various mentoring definitions.

Additionally, the data used in this study were gathered using an online data panel. Online data panels have been criticized for higher dropout rates than conventional methods (Birnbaum 2004). However, data collected online have been shown to possess similar item variability, factor structures, and covariance structures as data collected through traditional methods (Stanton, 1998). Furthermore, data were collected using online panels have been shown to be as reliable and demographically representative as data collected through traditional methods (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). The authors perceived the advantages of using an online data panel for data collection, such as access to salesperson respondents employed in various industries with varying mentor sources, as outweighing the aforementioned disadvantages.

Directions for Future Research

This research provides many avenues for further inquiry into salesperson mentoring. For example, research finds that different selling situations (e.g., missionary sales, trade sales, technical sales) moderate the interrelationships between job behaviors and attitudes (Avlonitis & Panagopoulos, 2006). A possible avenue for future inquiry is examining the impact of mentoring on salesperson multi-faceted satisfaction across different selling situations. Additionally, research should examine the influence of mentoring with respect to varying levels of boundary spanning conditions (e.g., autonomy, ambiguity, interaction, discretionary influence). Furthermore, future research could examine the influence of mentor characteristics on downstream salesperson outcomes. In addition to examining interpersonal characteristics of the mentor (e.g., supportiveness), such research should examine whether the rank or experience of organizational and external mentors changes the nature of the posited relationships. For example, more senior organizational mentors may, among other things, provide even greater support that may aid mentees in better navigating their work environment, improve selling and relationship efforts, and develop perspective. These accentuated effects may thus lead to even greater beneficial outcomes.

Salesperson mentees with external mentors did not report higher levels of satisfaction with many of the job facets than salespeople without mentors. Given that approximately 43% of the mentee sample had external mentors, it seems pertinent that research further scrutinize the influence, if any, of mentoring provided by external mentors on mentee multi-faceted job satisfaction. Within this study, the true effect of mentoring provided by external mentors on mentee multi-faceted job satisfaction may be obscured by the absence of a moderating variable that influences effect strength and or directionally. For example, does the strength of the effect of mentoring provided by external mentors on mentee multi-faceted job satisfaction differ based on the role of the mentor, or topic emphasized by the external mentor? Research examining salesperson perceptions of effective sales managers provides a foundation for such an approach (e.g., Deeter-Schmelz, Kennedy, & Goebel, 2002). Specifically, examining the role of the sales mentor (i.e., communicator, motivator, coach) and topics (e.g., motivation, relationship development and maintenance, ethics, leadership, presentation) emphasized may elucidate any influence of mentoring provided by external mentors on mentee multi-faceted job satisfaction. Examining the role of the sales mentor across selling situations and environments may also yield insight into when mentoring provided by external mentors is most impactful, and consequently the role the mentor should emphasize in specific situations/contexts. In addition to offering greater insight into the relationship between mentoring provided by external mentors and mentee multi-faceted job satisfaction, such an approach may offer greater insight into the influence of other types of mentoring relationships on salesperson mentee multi-faceted job satisfaction.

Research should also investigate the influence of mentoring, mentor source, and mentor-mentee relationship quality when the mentee is a first-level sales manager. Outcomes could include the performance, affect, turnover, and career progression of the first-level sales manager, as well as salespersons reporting to this manager. By investigating mentoring's direct benefits through the first-level sales manager's outcomes and mentoring's indirect benefits through the salesperson's outcomes,

organizations may develop a more comprehensive understanding of the benefits of mentoring relationships. Lastly, although results of H1e indicate that salesperson mentees did not report higher levels of satisfaction with pay than non-mentees, research is encouraged to re-examine H1e given the limited number of mentees ($n = 117$), higher unadjusted and adjusted means on satisfaction with pay for mentees than non-mentees, and the p-value.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examines the relationships between mentoring and the source of the mentoring relationship on salesperson multi-faceted job satisfaction. Results indicate that mentoring is positively associated with mentee satisfaction with supervisors, overall job, company policy and support, promotion and advancement, coworkers, and customers. Further, the results indicate that organizational mentors more strongly impact mentee satisfaction with supervisors, overall job, company policy and support, pay, and coworkers compared to external mentors.

REFERENCES

- Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., Poteet, M. L., Lentz, E., and Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 127-136.
- Avlonitis, G. J., and Panagopoulos, N. G. (2006). Role stress, attitudes, and job outcomes in business-to-business selling: Does the type of selling situation matter? *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 26(1), 67-77.
- Birnbaum, M. H. (2004). Human research and data collection via the Internet. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 803-832.
- Blocker, C. P., Cannon, J. P., Panagopoulos, N. G., and Sager, J. K. (2012). The role of the sales force in value creation and appropriation: New directions for research. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 32(1), 15-27.

- Boles, J., Madupalli, R., Rutherford, B., and Andy Wood, J. (2007). The relationship of facets of salesperson job satisfaction with affective organizational commitment. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 22(5), 311-321.
- Boyer, S. L., Artis, A. B., Solomon, P., & Fleming, D. E. (2012). Improving sales performance with self-directed learning. *Marketing Management Journal*, 22(2), 61-75.
- Bradford, K., Brown, S., Ganesan, S., Hunter, G., Onyemah, V., Palmatier, R., Rouziès, D., Spiro, R., Sujan, H. & Weitz, B. (2010). The embedded sales force: Connecting buying and selling organizations. *Marketing Letters*, 21(3), 239-253.
- Brashear, T. G., Bellenger, D. N., Boles, J. S., and Barksdale Jr, H. C. (2006). An exploratory study of the relative effectiveness of different types of sales force mentors. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 26(1), 7-18.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk a new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 6(1), 3-5.
- Chao, G. T., Walz, P. M., & Gardner, P. D. (1992). Formal and informal mentorships: A comparison on mentoring functions and contrast with nonmentored counterparts. *Personnel Psychology*, 45(3), 619-636.
- Churchill Jr, G. A., Ford, N. M., & Walker Jr, O. C. (1974). Measuring the job satisfaction of industrial salesmen. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 11(3), 254-260.
- Comer, J. M., Machleit, K. A., & Lagace, R. R. (1989). Psychometric assessment of a reduced version of INDSALES. *Journal of Business Research*, 18(4), 291-302.
- Deeter-Schmelz, D. R., Kennedy, K. N., & Goebel, D. J. (2002). Understanding sales manager effectiveness: Linking attributes to sales force values. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 31(7), 617-626.
- Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(2), 254-267.
- Ensher, E. A., Thomas, C., & Murphy, S. E. (2001). Comparison of traditional, step-ahead, and peer mentoring on protégés' support, satisfaction, and perceptions of career success: A social exchange perspective. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15(3), 419-438.
- Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10(4), 309-320.
- Fine, L. M., & Pullins, E. B. (1998). Peer mentoring in the industrial sales force: An exploratory investigation of men and women in developmental relationships. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 18(4), 89-103.
- Friend, S. B., Johnson, J. S., Rutherford, B. N., & Alexander Hamwi, G. (2013). INDSALES model: A facet-level job satisfaction model among salespeople. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 33(4), 419-438.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, 39-50.
- Dixon, A. L., Gassenheimer, J. B., & Feldman Barr, T. (2003). Identifying the lone wolf: A team perspective. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 23(3), 205-219.
- Hackman, G. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159-170.
- Haggard, D. L., Dougherty, T. W., Turban, D. B., & Wilbanks, J. E. (2011). Who is a mentor? A review of evolving definitions and implications for research. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 280-304.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., and Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis (7th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.

- Hartmann, N. N., & Rutherford, B. N. (2015). Psychological contract breach's antecedents and outcomes in salespeople: The roles of psychological climate, job attitudes, and turnover intention. *Industrial Marketing Management, 51*, 158-170.
- Hartmann, N. N., Rutherford, B. N., Hamwi, G. A., & Friend, S. B. (2013). The effects of mentoring on salesperson commitment. *Journal of Business Research, 66*(11), 2294-2300.
- Hartmann, N. N., Rutherford, B. N., Feinberg, R., & Anderson, J. G. (2014). Antecedents of mentoring: Do multi-faceted job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment matter? *Journal of Business Research, 67*(9), 2039-2044.
- Hatch, M. J. (1993). The dynamics of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(4), 657-693.
- Hu, L. T., and Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1-55.
- Ingram, T. N., LaForge, R. W., Locander, W. B., MacKenzie, S. B., and Podsakoff, P. M. (2005). New directions in sales leadership research. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 25*(2), 137-154.
- Johnson, J. S. (2016). Improving online panel data usage in sales research. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 36*(1), 74-85.
- Johnston, M. W., Varadarajan, P. R., Futrell, C. M., and Sager, J. (1987). The relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among new salespeople. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 7*(3), 29-38.
- Jones, E., Brown, S. P., Zoltners, A. A., and Weitz, B. A. (2005). The changing environment of selling and sales management. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 25*(2), 105-111.
- Katsikea, E., Theodosiou, M., Perdakis, N., and Kehagias, J. (2011). The effects of organizational structure and job characteristics on export sales managers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of World Business, 46*(2), 221-233.
- Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life*. Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman.
- Krush, M. T., Agnihotri, R. A. J., Trainor, K. J., & Krishnakumar, S. (2013). The salesperson's ability to bounce back: Examining the moderating role of resiliency on forms of intra-role job conflict and job attitudes, behaviors and performance. *Marketing Management Journal, 23*(1), 42-56.
- Ladik, D. M., Marshall, G. W., Lassk, F. G., and Moncrief, W. C. (2002). Reexamining gender issues in salesperson propensity to leave. *Industrial Marketing Management, 31*(7), 599-607.
- Lankau, M. J., and Scandura, T. A. (2002). An investigation of personal learning in mentoring relationships: Content, antecedents, and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(4), 779-790.
- Locander, D. A., Weinberg, F. J., Mulki, J. P., & Locander, W. B. (2015). Salesperson lone wolf tendencies: The roles of social comparison and mentoring in a mediated model of performance. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 23*(4), 351-369.
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 4*(4), 309-336.
- Myers, J. L., Well, A. D., and Lorch, R. F. (2013). *Research design and statistical analysis* (3rd ed., New York: Routledge.
- Onyemah, V. (2009). The effects of coaching on salespeople's attitudes and behaviors: A contingency approach. *European Journal of Marketing, 43*(7/8), 938-960.
- Parasuraman, A., and Futrell, C. M. (1983). Demographics, job satisfaction, and propensity to leave of industrial salesmen. *Journal of Business Research, 11*(1), 33-48.
- Pettijohn, L., Pettijohn, C., & Taylor, A. (2009). Retail sales training: activities and effects on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover and customer-orientation. *Marketing Management Journal, 19*(1), 46-57.
- Pullins, E. B., and Fine, L. M. (2002). How the performance of mentoring activities affects the mentor's job outcomes. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 22*(4), 259-271.

- Ragins, B. R. (1997). Diversified mentoring relationships in organizations: A power perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(2), 482-521.
- Ragins, B. R., Cotton, J. L., and Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring: The effects of type of mentor, quality of relationship, and program design on work and career attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(6), 1177-1194.
- Reisenwitz, T. H., & Iyer, R. (2009). Differences in generation X and generation Y: Implications for the organization and marketers. *Marketing Management Journal*, 19(2), 91-103.
- Russ, F. A., and McNeilly, K. M. (1995). Links among satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intentions: The moderating effect of experience, gender, and performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 34(1), 57-65.
- Rutherford, B., Boles, J., Hamwi, G. A., Madupalli, R., and Rutherford, L. (2009). The role of the seven dimensions of job satisfaction in salesperson's attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(11), 1146-1151.
- Schein, E. H. (1985), *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schetzle, D, and Delpechitre, D. (2013). The impact of sales manager characteristics on salesperson's trust and commitment to the relationship. *Marketing Management Journal*, 23(1), 102-119.
- Schetzle, D, and Drollinger, Tanya (2014). The use of dominance analysis to identify key factors in salespeople's affective commitment toward the sales manager and organizational commitment. *Marketing Management Journal*, 24(1), 1-15.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., and Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Stanton, J. M. (1998). An empirical assessment of data collection using the Internet. *Personnel Psychology*. 51(3), 709-725.
- Stevens, J. P. (2009). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences (5th ed.)*. New Jersey: Routledge Academic.
- Swain, S. D., Weathers, D., and Niedrich, R. W. (2008). Assessing three sources of misresponse to reversed Likert items. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(1), 116-131.
- Tabachnick, B. G., and Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics (3rd ed.)*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2010). *Employment in parts salespersons*. Retrieved March 3, 2013 from https://www.google.com/url?q=ftp://ftp.bls.gov/pub/special.requests/ep/ind-occ.matrix/occ_xls/occ_41-2022.xls&sa=U&ei=_5RTUdqePJDPigKtIG4AQ&ved=0CBIQFjAE&client=internal-udspsc&usg=AFQjCNH1enfBrhcyUcWQI8CaueWxZ65zg
- Zolkiewski, J. (2011). Value, power, and health care services in the UK: A business-to-business services network perspective. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 27(3/4), 424-448.